DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 778 CS 512 368

AUTHOR	Appleby, Ellen, Comp.
TITLE	Pretending to Literacy--Learning Literacy through Drama. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Griffith Univ., Nathan, Queensland (Australia).
PUB DATE	2002-07-00
NOTE	26p.; Prepared by the Centre for Applied Theatre Research at Griffith University. Support provided by the Quality Teaching Programme (Commonwealth of Australia). Appendixes listed in table of contents are not available online.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text (MS Word): http://www.gu.edu.au/centre/atr/opt7/drama_lit_summary.doc.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; *Drama; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Literacy; *Models; Outcomes of Education; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Resource Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	*Griffith University (Australia)

ABSTRACT

Griffith University's (Australia) "Flying Drama School" visited Belmont State School in 2000, which inspired several teachers to want to learn more about drama education. One teacher at the school at that time approached a professor from Griffith University to design a professional development program in drama education: "Pretending to Literacy--Learning Literacy through Drama," to be funded through the Quality Teacher Program. The proposal was based on the Brisbane South Region Drama In-service Initiative. This evaluation report of this program is divided into the following sections: Summary of Evaluation Report--Main Points and Findings; Findings of the Evaluation (Introduction; Synopsis of the Project Proposal; Evaluation of Tier One; Participating Teachers' Drama Experience and Expectations of the Project; Introductory Session; Drama Training Model of Professional Development; Training Strategies Used by Each of the Drama Master Teachers; Teachers' Understandings and Perceptions of Drama as an Innovative Way into Literacy; Teachers Talking about Learning to Teach Drama; Achievements of Teachers to Date--to May 2002; Discussion of Emergent Issues; Recommendations; and Conclusion). (Contains 152 notes and 12 references.) (NKA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 778

Pretending to Literacy - Learning Literacy through Drama

Tier One: September – December 2001
Tier Two: 2002 ongoing

Project Partners:
Flying Drama School, Centre for Applied Theatre Research, Griffith University, Nathan, Brisbane
Belmont School Cluster Learning Development Centre (Literacy), Belmont, Brisbane

Funded by:
Quality Teaching Programme (Commonwealth of Australia)

EVALUATION REPORT

Project Designer: Professor John O'Toole, CATR, Griffith University

Project Initiator: Susanne Butler, Literacy Coordinator, Belmont Cluster Learning Development Centre

Project Coordination: Belmont Learning Development Centre and Centre for Applied Theatre Research

Project Research and Evaluation: Ellen Appleby, CATR, Griffith University

CENTRE for APPLIED THEATRE RESEARCH

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. O'Toole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY, JULY 2002

© Griffith University, July 2002

CS 512 368

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pretending to Literacy - Learning Literacy through Drama

Tier One: September – December 2001
Tier Two: 2002 ongoing

EVALUATION REPORT

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT - MAIN POINTS AND FINDINGS 1

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION 3

INTRODUCTION 3

SYNOPSIS OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL 3

- Structure, organization, partnerships and personnel 3
- Rationale for project focus 5
- Tiers and Phases 4
- First Tier 4
- Second Tier 5
- Project Evaluation 5
- Alignment 5
- Further networking 5

THE EVALUATION OF TIER ONE 5
- Methodology of the Evaluation 6

PARTICIPATING TEACHERS' DRAMA EXPERIENCE AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE PROJECT 6

THE INTRODUCTORY SESSION 7
- Brief Outline of the Introductory Session 7
- Understanding the Aims of the Project 7
- Documentation/Handouts 7
- Key Teacher Role 7
- The Adult Role-play – The Panel Show: Tim's story 7
- Concerns about the Introductory Session 8
- Teacher participants 8

DRAMA TRAINING MODEL OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 8
- Modelling – The Classroom Experience 8
- Initial Timelines and Planning 9
- Time taken up by the Project 9
- Reflective Practice 10
- Problems with the Drama Training Model 10

THE TRAINING STRATEGIES USED BY EACH OF THE DRAMA MASTER TEACHERS 10
- Ross Prior 11
- Simone Waller 11

TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS AND PERCEPTIONS OF DRAMA AS A INNOVATIVE WAY INTO LITERACY 12

TEACHERS TALKING ABOUT LEARNING TO TEACH DRAMA
- As an Innovative Approach to Literacy 13
- Achieving other KLA outcomes 15
- Achieving other outcomes 15

KEY TEACHER ROLE 16

ACHIEVEMENTS OF TEACHERS TO DATE (TO MAY 2002) 17
- Individual level 17
- School level 17
- Organisational level 17

DISCUSSION OF EMERGENT ISSUES
- Learning to Use Drama as Learning Medium 17
- The Model of Teacher Professional Development 17
- Teachers Moving from Tier One into Tier Two 18

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Improving Tier One 18
- Moving into Tier Two 19

CONCLUSION 19

Bibliography 21
Endnotes 21

APPENDICES 23
- One: Original Proposal
- Two: Interview Questions
- Three: Introductory Session Sequence
- Four: Initial Survey and Results
- Five: Drama Units and other support materials from Master Drama Teachers
- Six: Summary of Literacy Tasks achieved
- Seven: Examples of Students' Work
- Eight: Summary of Teachers' Achievements Tier Two

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pretending to Literacy - Learning Literacy through Drama

Project Evaluation Report

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS AND FINDINGS

Griffith University's *Flying Drama School* (*FDS*)[1] visited Belmont State School in 2000, which inspired several teachers to want to learn more about drama education. Sue Butler was a teacher at the school at that time and approached Prof. John O'Toole from Griffith University to design a professional development program in drama education: *Pretending to Literacy – Learning Literacy through Drama*, to be funded through the Quality Teacher Program. John based the proposal on the Brisbane South Region Drama In-service Initiative (Drama Advisory Committee, 1980) which had found: "the concept of a classroom-based resource teacher who works intensively for several weeks developing and teaching a single unit of work with the client teacher is a viable method of providing in-service support; if the calibre of the teaching is high, and care is taken to cause minimal disruption to the school program, the credibility of this type of in-service work in the eyes of practising teachers is probably greater than any other than is possible" (p. 15)

Project Outline

Rationale:

- drama is an innovative approach to literacy;
- drama is essentially experiential learning;
- dramatic techniques in the classroom can provide motivation, purpose, context and focus for improving literacy and oracy;
- drama can develop important creative skills for living with change;
- drama is well aligned with the new directions for literacy as outlined in Literate Futures (Education Queensland, 2000).

Structure, organization:

The project was structured in two tiers:

- The first tier aimed to provide teachers with training and support from experienced drama educators to set up dramatic structures and models in the classroom to improve literacy and oracy outcomes. This training was situated within normal classrooms and integrated curriculum across a range of Key Learning Areas including English, Studies of Society and Environment, Science and Arts.
- The second tier aimed to support teachers to become resource teachers for the whole school and second-generation trainers in drama.

Coordination of the project:

The project was coordinated by

1. Sue Butler, the Literacy Coordinator of Education Queensland Learning and Development Centre (LDC) coordinator (First and Second Tier) and
2. Griffith University's Centre for Applied Theatre Research (CATR) (First Tier).

It was funded through the Quality Teaching Program.

Drama educators and participating teachers:

Two drama Master Teachers from CATR, trained seven teachers from the Belmont Cluster - Belmont SS, Carina SS, Camp Hill SS, Camp Hill Infants SS, Whites Hill SS, Mt Gravatt SS, Camp Hill SHS.

Evaluation of the project:

The evaluation of tier one, the training phase, aimed to:

- assess as far as possible the outcomes against the original aims of the proposal;

[1] The *Flying Drama School* is the professional development arm of Griffith University's Centre for Applied Theatre Research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To a lesser degree the participating teachers' progress was monitored as they moved into tier two as they started to consolidate and extend their own drama practice as well as train others.

Emergent themes:

The themes that emerged during the project were divided into two main categories.

- Challenges and successes as the teachers tackled drama teaching, particularly to achieve innovative and improved literacy outcomes.
- How, and whether, the professional development process supported teachers to use drama as a learning medium.

Main results at end of Tier One:

The teachers were quick to realise the enormous potential of drama, not only as an innovative approach to literacy but as an effective curriculum integrator and a way of engaging students particularly emotional engagement with the themes, characters and issues. They also noted, particularly during the follow up interviews, that drama pedagogy aligns well with latest curriculum advances in Queensland, such as Productive Pedagogies and Rich Tasks, and is a powerful means of allowing students to actively demonstrate learning outcomes.

The professional training model in drama education was clearly successful in meeting the goals of tier one, the training phase of the project. The teachers demonstrated that they were able to use drama strategies and structures with their classes. They were able to discuss and constructively reflect on the successes, challenges and problems that they encountered with their new and expanded pedagogical approach. They all acknowledged and demonstrated a range of literacy outcomes that resulted from using drama as a learning medium. In addition, all the teachers enjoyed the professional development approach, and apart from needing further planning support, they were keen to continue with this approach to literacy.

One major limitation of Tier One was the short amount of time allocated to it, only 6 weeks. Drama education demands that teachers reexamine their approach to teaching, and requires a substantial change in their teaching approach, particularly in their planning. To achieve this teachers need ongoing peer and mentor support, especially during the critical phase when they start plan and implement their own drama units. In this project this support was not provided in an explicit way, and the teachers were slow to move into the next stage of developing their own units. The teachers who had some drama experience have moved into designing new drama units, however the teachers who were new to drama, struggled well into 2002, and several requested further help to get started on their own units.

However, the level of support needed by the novice drama teachers during this critical transferral time appears to be comparatively low, as one planning session and a reflective session was proven sufficient so far. The support of Sue Butler and Ellen Appleby as the evaluator and critical friend has been essential to the ongoing drama work of these teachers especially those who has no previous drama training. **The provision of this ongoing support appears, from the results of this study, to be the most important recommendation of this report.**

Main recommendations for future projects:

This study uncovered several ways to that teachers might be further supported as they develop their new drama teaching skills by the provision of:

(a) additional planning time after the training phase:
(b) easily accessible planning support during this next planning phase.
(c) the coordination of (a) and (b) built into the initial training phase. This study clearly demonstrated that this *coordination role is* ***critical*** *to ensure the teachers apply and develop their new skills.*
(d) improved access to quality and appropriate drama resources..
(e) an adult extended role-play experience as an additional component to the training model.

References:

Education Queensland (2000). *Literate futures: report of literacy review for Queensland State Schools*. Brisbane: Queensland Government.

Balaisis, J. (2002). The challenge of teaching "in role". *Applied Theatre Researcher, 3*.

Drama Advisory Committee. (1980). *Classroom based in-service in the strategies of educational drama: evaluation of an in-service model*. Brisbane: Department of Speech and Drama, Mt Gravatt College of Advanced Education.

Report researched and compiled by
Ellen Appleby
June 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Findings of the Evaluation Study

Introduction

Griffith University's innovative interactive theatre group, the *Flying Drama School* (*FDS*)[2] visited Belmont State School in 2000, and inspired several teachers to want to learn more about drama education. Sue Butler was a teacher at the school at that time and approached Prof. John O'Toole from Griffith University to design a professional development program in drama education: *Pretending to Literacy – Learning Literacy through Drama*, to be funded through the Quality Teacher Program. John based the proposal on the Brisbane South Region Drama In-service Initiative (Drama Advisory Committee, 1980) which had found: "the concept of a classroom-based resource teacher who works intensively for several weeks developing and teaching a single unit of work with the client teacher is a viable method of providing in-service support; if the calibre of the teaching is high, and care is taken to cause minimal disruption to the school program, the credibility of this type of in-service work in the eyes of practising teachers is probably greater than any other than is possible" (p. 15).

This project supported teachers as they learnt to use drama education as an innovative pedagogical approach to achieve literacy learning outcomes. Ross Prior summarised the overarching framework of the in-service model: "it [the professional development model] was logical, and grounded in practice - there was a balance between practice and theory, one infusing the other - praxis. And this helped the project along. The teachers engaged with this process without knowing ..."[1]

Synopsis of the Project Proposal

Underlying Principles

- Innovative pedagogical approaches to literacy;
- Learning literacy through educational drama pedagogy that is essentially experiential learning;
- Drama enhances spoken English and oracy development, particularly process drama;
- Six phase cycle - whole school approach, key teachers in drama to train others;
- Program to run within normal classroom and curriculum across a range of KLA's including English, SOSE, Science and Arts.

Dramatic techniques in the classroom can:

- Provide motivation, purpose, context and focus for improving literacy and oracy;
- Provide purpose and motivation for written tasks in meaningful and lifelike contexts;
- Provide framework for integration of KLAs, through study of living contexts;
- Provide opportunities for reflection, comparisons and practice;
- Develop important creative skills for living with change;

To implement drama pedagogical approach, teachers need to:

- Gain basic knowledge of elements and structures of drama;
- Gain understandings of specialised techniques of class management;
- Gain confidence in using the approach;
- Overcome lack of experience of drama as learning medium in own education, and teacher education.

Structure, organization, partnerships and personnel

The project design and grant application was devised and written by Prof John O'Toole, assisted by Jessica Veurmann-Betts and Sue Butler.

The professional development approach was structured in two tiers:

First Tier (phases 1-5): Provide teachers with training and support to set up appropriate dramatic structures and models in the classroom to improve literacy and oracy outcomes.

Second Tier (phases 6+): Teachers to become resource teachers for the whole school and second generation trainers in drama.

[2] The *Flying Drama School* is the professional development arm of Griffith University's Centre for Applied Theatre Research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Coordination of the project (Tier One):
Education Queensland Learning and Development Centre (LDC) literacy coordinator, Sue Butler: facilitate introductory meeting, selection of teachers, video of master teachers' drama process for future reference.
Griffith University Centre for Applied Theatre Research (CATR) coordinator, Jessica Vermann-Betts, budget and payment of drama specialist master teachers and evaluator, supporting master teachers in implementing Tier One.

Ongoing coordination (into Tier Two and beyond):
LDC literacy coordinator, Sue Butler (over 3 years): Oversee ongoing implementation plan, monitor innovation and growth in teacher practices to improve student outcomes in literacy, make modifications to enabling strategy when necessary, support classroom visits throughout cluster, video strategies (documentation of 'model'), support teachers future reflection and planning, create further PD opportunities, foster sharing though networks, newsletter online.

Funding
Quality Teaching Program (Education Queensland) provided bulk of funding, 70% of $20,155 initially and final 30% when QTP evaluation received (Sue Butler to write this).

Drama Master Teachers
Simone Waller and Ross Prior

Participants
Teachers from Belmont Cluster (Belmont SS, Carina SS, Camp Hill SS, Camp Hill Infants SS, Whites Hill SS, Mt Gravatt SS, Camp Hill SHS).
Selected teachers to become key teachers within their own schools.
Teachers involved, phase one:

Jenine Nisbet-Smith, Camp Hill SS, yr 6
Robyn Grimshaw, Mt Gravatt SS, yr 7
Jim Vickers, Whites Hill SS, yr 5
Simon Banks, Carina SS, special groups yr 7
Cathy Costello, Belmont SS, yr 1
Kaylene Bell, Belmont SS, yr 2
Cathy Holyoak, Carina Pre-school

Academic partners
Griffith University Centre for Applied Theatre Research (CATR) provided the training program of master classes, joint planning and team teaching in first tier of project.

Evaluators
Ellen Appleby, Griffith University, CATR
Sue Butler, Education Queensland, Literacy Coordinator of Belmont LDC
Ian Buchan, Review Officer Belmont Cluster, Education Queensland.

Tiers and Phases

(Full outline in Appendix One)

First Tier
Pre-project preparation: Introductory, diagnostic workshop for teachers from Belmont Cluster. Facilitated by John O'Toole, Jessica Veurmann-Bettes with sessions by Simone Waller and Ross Prior. Participants identified. Evaluators present.

Demonstration phase – planning and modelling drama teaching:
Planning meeting
- Identify focus of demonstration drama, and possible literacy outcomes – teachers to meet with drama master teachers (one hour);

Lesson 1: - Modelling and reflection:
- Teaching – master teachers to visit each teacher's classroom and demonstrate first lesson;
- Reflection – after each demonstration lesson, some reflection time to analyse the drama strategies and student outcomes;

Lesson 2: Auxiliary teaching, reflection and planning:
- Planning meeting – second lesson planning with all teachers, teachers to take in auxiliary role (teacher-in-role),
- Teaching – master teachers to visit each teacher's classroom and run second lesson with teachers taking on auxiliary role;
- Reflection and replanning – reflection, analysis and planning each teacher's next lesson.

Lesson 3 and 4 : Lead teaching – teachers take increasing roles as drama educators until running whole lesson:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Reflection and replanning – fine tuning planning, teachers to plan subsequent lessons.

Independent teaching – teachers take complete drama lessons:

- Teaching lessons to conclude particular unit, finishing literacy/oracy outcomes;
- Reflection and planning for future workshops – key strategies and techniques revisited, consolidated in form of handbook using this key learning area/literacy unit as an exemplar;
- Action plans to share expertise amongst colleagues within own school and develop online stories of success.

Second Tier

- Key teachers to move into a Phase 1 of a new five phase cycle, aiming for autonomy of practice within participating schools and Belmont cluster schools (Belmont SS, Carina SS, Camp Hill SS, Camp Hill Infants SS, Whites Hill SS, Mt Gravatt SS, Camp Hill SHS);
- Developing a support network – join Queensland Association for Drama in Education (QADIE), make primary/high school links;
- Key teacher/master teacher – resource teacher for drama in own age band or school. School literacy/drama interest group will be established to begin similar preliminary diagnostic workshop and a new five-phase cycle. Using videos made of first cycle as resource.

Project Evaluation

Data collection and analysis appropriate to ethnographic and action research. Visits to preliminary and final workshops, 2 visits to each school (one each at teaching and follow up session) and one retrospective to interview teachers individually and in focus groups, and if appropriate, students. NB A limited evaluation was only possible because of grant allowance did not provide for an evaluation.

Alignment

Strategic Positioning

- Project is aligned to the discussion of literacy in *Literate Futures: Report of the Literacy Review for Queensland State Schools* (Queensland, 2000).

Further networking

- Project evaluation and success will be published or made accessible to other teachers through LDC website, Meanjin, QADIE, Applied Theatre Research Website (Griffith University).
- Support networks for participating teachers implemented and supported by LDC.

Evaluation of the Project

An evaluation of Tier One of the project was written into the original proposal and that occurred during and after the teachers had participated in the series of classroom-based workshops that involved collaborative planning and reflection. Tier One took about 6 weeks, and during that time the evaluator attended every planning meeting for the whole group, one classroom-based session with each teacher and the associated reflection, and conducted post-course interviews with the drama master teachers and each of the teachers. Sue Butler also videoed a complete set of the drama classroom-based training sequences for each of the drama educators. So one video was made of an early childhood class, and one of an upper primary class as they moved through the drama unit with the modelling, support and guidance of each of the master teachers. These will be useful during Tier Two of the project, when the teachers will support other teachers in their cluster in using drama as an innovative approach to literacy.

The brief for the evaluation, as stated in the original proposal was twofold.

- To assess as far as possible, the outcomes against the original aims of the proposal.
- To use these findings as action research to inform and strengthen Tier Two of the project and future projects.

The program funding body, QTP, also required audit-style evaluation and Sue together with the teachers completed this. Ian Buchan, a review officer for the Belmont Cluster, Education Queensland also attended the project evaluation planning meetings.

To a lesser degree Tier Two is being evaluated to assess the longer term effects in the teachers' practice of drama and the effectiveness of the teacher professional development approach. This part of the evaluation involved three of the participating teachers, Jenine, Robyn and Simon, who were interviewed at the end of term 1, 2002. In addition, Sue Butler has kept careful records of the activities undertaken by the teachers that resulted from Tier One. The evaluator also attended the post Tier One planning meetings of the whole group. Field notes were taken at all of these meetings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Methodology of the Evaluation

The project aimed to produce change in how teachers approached literacy through drama education. It was an action research process and the evaluation had to be appropriate[2]. The evaluation therefore needed to:

- Uncover the views of all the participants
- Establish the role, stance and subjectivity of the researcher/evaluator
- Develop trust between the researcher and participants
- Establish trustworthiness and authenticity of the data
- Monitor change (Orton, 1994).

Data was collected from several different sources so that the depth and range of the participants' and drama master teachers' stories that included questionnaires, interviews, reflective journals, field notes from planning/reflection and evaluation meetings. Data transcripts and summaries of the audio recorded interviews and group meetings were entered into NUDIST qualitative data software. The references to the data sources of quotes and summaries of teachers' comments are included within this report as endnotes.

Where common threads, concerns and understandings emerged, some conclusions about the effectiveness of the professional development approach and recommendations about future projects have been drawn. It must be noted however, that concerns of *individual* teachers and drama master teachers were also built into the conclusions, particularly if these individuals referred to them regularly over a period of time. To further establish trustworthiness and validity, whenever possible, prior data collected from interviews and meetings was used to inform and extend further discussions with the teachers. Finally, a draft of this final report was given to the teachers for amendments or additions.

During the post-course evaluation interviews, teachers were asked specifically if they thought the goals of Tier One of the project had been achieved, and if they were satisfied with the professional development process. They were encouraged to share their thinking about how drama contributed to innovative approaches to literacy, what drama uniquely offered and whether they thought their students approached literacy tasks differently when drama was used as a learning medium, and if they thought there were improved literacy outcomes.[3]

In the longer term, Tier Two and beyond, some of the teachers would become drama resource teachers and trainers for other teachers in their school cluster. Thus these teachers would be drama education mentors and eventually drama master teachers in their own right. This is necessarily a process of long-term empowerment. In an evaluation process to support this empowerment aim, it was important to develop a reciprocal relationship between the researcher and participants by creating conditions for professional dialogue that:

(a) was reflective and critical;

(b) gave the teachers have opportunities to creation personal and shared meanings from ideological, theoretical and experiential stances (Lather, 1986).

One significant influence on this evaluation as an empowering process was my position as a primary drama educator; specifically I use drama as a learning medium to achieve outcomes in environmental education[4]. I hoped the teachers were able relate to me as a peer as I shared with them my experiences of drama education as I found resonance with theirs. It was no surprise therefore, that the teachers wanted to use the post-course evaluation meetings with me, as an opportunity to continue their reflective practice and further develop their understandings. By actively developing this reciprocity between the teachers and the evaluator, the dialogues generated (which were audio recorded) were rich sources of insights and understandings about how the teachers approached and were learning about drama as a learning medium. As I engaged with these teachers and their experiences, successes and struggles, I found it was not just the teacher-participants whose perspectives and beliefs about drama education were evolving, but my own thinking about drama education was also being expanded and informed.

Participating Teachers' Drama Experience and Expectations of the Project

From the pre-course survey[5], six of the seven teachers said they had used drama in some form recently. Two teachers had used some form of drama as a learning medium before and had let their practice lapse, while three identified they were using it on a fairly regular basis. During the interviews and reflections the specific drama experiences of each teacher emerged:

- one teacher had been trained in drama education but was using only the performance aspect of it, but not regularly;[6]
- one teacher had been using performance but drama as learning medium was new to her;[7]
- one teacher regularly used teacher-in-role strategies but had not considered them as drama;[8]
- one teacher had little experience or knowledge of drama as a learning medium;[9]
- one teacher had trained in drama as a learning medium and had been using it as a classroom integrating device over several years, for at least one term each year;[10]
- one teacher had limited experience in drama but had not considered its potential as a motivator for literacy;[11]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- one teacher knew about drama as a learning medium but used it in a limited way because she had been unable to justify it to other teachers.[12]

The teachers had a range of expectations and reasons for participating, however they all expressed an interest in drama education, and most mentioned a desire to better engage their students. They all hoped the course would give them more confidence, knowledge, skills, ideas to implement drama to improve literacy outcomes, and a couple anticipated it would provide more enjoyable and different learning experiences for their students. Two teachers thought drama could be a vehicle to increase knowledge and understandings, and one teacher was keen to link it to achieving the aims of productive pedagogies. Literacy, social studies and relationships education ranked highly on the list of curriculum areas they thought drama would support. In addition, using drama to achieve better communication, sense of self and others and transforming information into other forms, specifically Technology, were mentioned.[13]

The Introductory Session

(Full details see Appendix Three)

Brief Outline of the Introductory Session

- Introduction, aims of the project including two short practical drama demonstrations - John O'Toole, Project Designer, Centre for Applied Theatre Research, Griffith University
- Adult drama session: The Panel Show, Tim's Story - Ross Prior, Drama Master Teacher (upper school), Centre for Applied Theatre Research, Griffith University
- Using drama in the classroom, The Quest - Simone Waller, Drama Master Teacher (lower school), Centre for Applied Theatre Research, Griffith University
- Outline of the project - John O'Toole, Jessica Veurmann-Betts
- Selecting the participants
- Short meeting of the participants and master teachers to arrange the first meeting time.

Understanding the Aims of the Project

The teachers enjoyed the introductory session. During this session, the aims of the project were set out clearly and understood by all those present except one teacher who arrived late and took a while to pick up what was happening. Six teachers chose to be involved in the project together with one teacher who did not attend this session but was asked later by her deputy principal to join the project because of lack of early childhood teachers.[14]

The project advertising was misunderstood, as is illustrated by one teacher's comment: "Coming from ground zero, that [the introductory session] was good, if I had experience it might have been too simple. I did not have any idea of what it was about. I thought it was going to be a drama workshop, where we were given some ideas, I found by the end of it that it was a project and that I'm involved!"[15]

Documentation/Handouts

Four participants requested some documentation of the introductory session, particularly the structure of the participatory dramas and exercises, and a summary of the whole session. They also noted that these handouts could be given to teachers unable to attend this session.[16]

Key Teacher Role

The ongoing commitment for key drama teachers was not fully understood from the introductory session, and the teachers' post course evaluation interviews identified this quite clearly (see later section of this report). Several teachers mentioned that it was not clear from the introductory session how many teachers would be asked to be key teachers and what it involved, particularly working across their school cluster.[17]

The Adult Role-play – The Panel Show: Tim's story

Three teachers thought this was the most valuable part of the introductory session.[18] It was suggested that this role-play would be a way to introduce drama to a school staff, by starting a staff meeting this way to give the staff a real drama experience at an adult level.[19]

Ross had some concerns that this role-play did not exemplify the real aims of classroom drama. He thought the experience was too shallow, and did not show drama as a "learning medium". This had repercussions as a teacher who had attended the introductory session and had not been involved in the project, had used example with her students. Ross was concerned that she may now believe that this is all there is classroom drama.[20]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers from Belmont SS who did attend the introductory session but were not involved in the project, discussed The Panel Show in their staff room the following day and said they really enjoyed it.[21] One teacher said that she felt that it motivated the teachers and gave them a taste of what their students would feel in a drama.[22]

Concerns about the Introductory Session

All teachers acknowledged that the introductory session was rushed. The drama master teachers were most concerned about this and suggested that a better use of time might be a jointly presented participatory session that not only engaged the teachers at an adult level and gave them a significant drama experience, but provided a stimulus for discussion about how drama could be used for different year levels.[23] Simone also suggested that to break into two groups, upper and lower school teachers after this immersion experience, would also utilise the time more productively.[24]

The teachers, however, were not so concerned by the rushed session, and said they would rather it be rushed through in one session than spread over two sessions as teachers' time is limited.[25] One teacher commented that this session could be tightened up a bit, or possibly abbreviated.[26]

Ross expressed concern that the process of selection of participating teachers was extremely rushed and messy. He thought some of the teachers who were not chosen to participate but had appeared to have an interest in drama education, were not given any clear way of being involved in the long term, particularly during Tier Two of the project.[27]

One participating teacher would have liked to hear how the project fitted into the bigger literacy picture during the introductory session.[28] Another teacher realised that the project was bit experimental, even though he had no problem with that.[29]

Teacher participants

The following teachers self-selected to be involved in the drama in-service:
Cathy Holyoak (Carina Preschool)
Kaylene Bell (Belmont SS yr 1)
Jim Vickers (Whites Hill SS, yr 5/6?)
Jenine Nesbitt-Smith (Camp Hill SS, yr 6)
Robyn Grimshaw (Mt Gravatt SS, yr7)
Simon Woods (Carina SS yr 6/7 extension class)

Cathy Costello did not attend the introductory session but was a participant.

Drama Training Model of Professional Development

The training process that was outlined in the proposal and further refined by drama master teachers had designed was well understood by the participants. Two teachers said they liked how the process was clear and well presented both in the introductory session and specifically by each of the drama educators. They like to know where they were going, what to expect, when they would be presenting lessons themselves and what they would be doing.[30]

Two of these teachers mentioned that they were particularly happy with how much care Simone took so the drama fitted in with they intended unit on the sea. One of these teachers said: "[Simone] did not just come in with her idea and say, we'll do this. She asked what are you doing in your room, and what we went through, and what things I wanted them to achieve, in literacy. It was not as though I was doing something separate. It blended in exactly with what I was doing. I had my program done out and I was able to say, this is what I am covering, and we were able to blend it in. It worked beautifully."[31]

Modelling – The Classroom Experience

Every teacher agreed that the best part of the process was the modelling of drama lessons by master drama teachers working with their students followed by the hand-over process that empowered them to take lessons using drama, particularly teacher-in-role. Two teachers commented that their observations of the master teachers working with their students gave them a chance to see student responses they would not have seen otherwise.[32] Each teacher gained a range of benefits from the modelling, and their responses were overwhelmingly supportive of this part of professional development process as the following quotes illustrate:

> "It was good having Ross come in and do those demonstration lessons early in the piece, to watch his techniques, questioning and reaction to what the kids said. That was a big help because I have not done any drama, ever."[33]

> "... if he had given me something in a book or on a tape and left me to read that and said, do that on Wednesday, there was a big danger that it would have happened just before morning tea! And also a danger of being over

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

confident, in some of things I did. I would have missed the point of some of the things that Ross wanted to get across. With him there and being able to watch for the first few sessions and watching how his roles changed and switched and how he used little techniques to do different things, that sort of inspired you to use the same ideas, copy his ideas." [34]

"Having the key teacher coming in and demonstrating ways of teaching of the drama in the classroom, with the kids, rather than attending a seminar where they were just telling and explaining things, they were actually in the classroom with us. So we could see how the children responded. It helped me a great deal, then when I went back to the classroom to do things..." [35]

"I agree [with Cathy], I think that was the best part, Simone was really good and the kids loved her. Someone could tell you a hundred times what to do, but to see her do it made it very practical I thought." [36]

"Having Ross in the classroom, him in total control and the slow hand over until I was doing the whole thing. Me and the kids developed confidence in this other person. It was good." [37]

"It was good to have someone come out and work with your students, like work with your class so you can see the techniques that they use, so can see how process from start to finish. It is quite different if you go to a workshop someone's talking about how it is done, but it is quite good to see it being done and being implemented." [38]

"With that coaching model - having them in the room showing you how the whole thing come together was good. I guess it's having that person to talk too - wondering why they're doing it that way and what it is they are doing." [39]

Initial Timelines and Planning

The advertising for the initial after-school meeting where the project was outlined and teachers were invited to participate was posted after the September school holidays and the meeting was on the first Tuesday of term. This only gave the teachers one day's notice of this meeting so the organising team felt the turn up of about 20 teachers was as many as could be expected. [40]

Time taken up by the Project

All the teachers initially had concerns about the time that the project would take up, so a question about this was specifically asked during the follow up evaluation interviews. Their responses indicated that, in fact, the drama training program was not too demanding on their time, with one teacher commenting "Practicalities were ok. Not too much time taken up, not a lot of out of school time. In school time was ok - busy time of year, but about right." [41] The once a week session with the drama master teachers suited the teachers, with most of them doing some extra literacy activities or drama preparation before each of these visits. Another teacher commented: "Once a week thing was good - practicalities of doing it meant you had to spread it out a bit." [42]

There was also the feeling that the one-hour sessions were too short: "[The classroom workshops] probably needed a bit longer, another 1/4 hour per session, and hour was a bit skint. Trying to get them built up into the stage where they were in groups ready to do something, and then watch each group perform, and have feedback. A little bit rushed." [43].

The early childhood teachers had most difficulty with the time allocation for the project, which started from the first planning session with Simone as it took a long time to work out the preschool workshop timetable due to their five-day fortnight.[44] However, Simone was keen to spend a lot of time in this planning phase as she wanted a good understanding of the teachers' interests, the curriculum they wanted to cover and the other pressures on the teachers' time so she could fit around this.[45]

Simone had concerns about the small number of classroom-based training sessions, and ran two extra sessions. She had clear reasons for doing this: "... Coming in raw like this is a really big ask for teachers to step in by lesson 3, too big an ask - that's why I went in extra sessions. I think it is too quick - they need to feel confident and comfortable with the medium before you can ask them to lead it."[46] She also used these sessions to get to know the students and allow them time to learn the conventions and basic drama structures (see section on Simone's drama process). One teacher talked about the value of these sessions: "With younger children it helps if you are doing something that is structured where they are used to using play. Even though it's a type of play, it's much more a teacher-directed activity, those little rituals help to cue them in, like a mental cue: meta-cognition. Or how do I think about drama: metalinguistics or how do I think about what I need to do. They were cuing techniques. They really clicked into those. They knew what was coming, and what we did." [47]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reflective Practice

At every phase of Tier One of the project there was a strong emphasis on the different forms of reflection considered necessary for artistic and professional growth and improved practice (Schön, 1983). In drama education this has been well documented as an effective way to improve practice (Taylor, 1996). The project included opportunities for: reflection in action, reflection during conversations after the event both formally and informally, personal thoughts and reflective journals.

All the teachers valued the reflection times with the drama educators particularly when the drama lessons were at the end of the day and teachers were able to reflect for half an hour or longer. The upper school teachers managed to find at least 20 minutes reflection time after most of the lessons with Ross, even though it meant juggling around duties[48]. Several teachers were explicit that these reflections were an essential part of the process.[49]

The early childhood teachers were less able to find time to reflect with Simone. She was concerned about this and noted that lunch duties or staff room events took priority and so most of the reflection times with her teachers were "on the move".[50] When asked about this during the post-course evaluation interviews, the teachers said that this lack of time could not be helped, and two teachers thought that email and phone calls with Simone had been sufficient.[51] One early childhood teacher however, would have liked more reflection time to talk about some of the important but subtle points of Simone's drama teaching that she thought would have given her better understandings of why things were done in a certain way.[52]

The reflective journal notebooks provided by Sue Butler were more important to some teachers than others, with all but two providing some written reflections or summaries of the training process. Two teachers provided some deeper insights into their thinking during their implementation of the drama process, and one teacher used reflective journals regularly as she said they were useful to her as well as an effective form of accountability.[53]

Two teachers mentioned specifically how valuable they had found the collaborative planning. One teacher said "The potential switched me on - thinking when the other teachers came out with ideas I had not considered, that was good, I thought 'Oh yeah, why not', and I really kicked myself for missing that because of my drama based focus."[54] The other felt more planning time would have helped her gain ideas to build more literacy into the dramatic episodes. She said: "I think perhaps we could have met again after 2 sessions with Ross, maybe the 4 of us could have talked about where we were going from there. I think we would have got a bit more out of it ... I might have done more writing [with my students] if I could have thought of what to do ... When someone says, I did this, I think 'Oh why didn't I think of that, what a good idea'. You just need someone sometimes else to spark ideas. It's good planning with somebody because you do get a lot more ideas."[55]

All but one of the teachers attended the follow-up group evaluation session that was held after school at the Belmont LDC. Most of them commented on its value. One teacher said: "It was nice having a wash up session at the end too, a week later, so that would give a chance to gather our thoughts and work and reflective journal and come together to make a professional approach of it rather than a fun wash up session... I enjoyed listening to the other teachers' stories."[56]

During the post-course evaluation interviews most of the teachers said they would be interested in forming a small drama network to meet regularly at the LDC to specifically unpack and discuss drama units and share their own drama practice.[57]

Problems with the Drama Training Model

Both Ross and Simone shared the concern that the teachers had not been involved in an extended drama experience at an adult level before they started the classroom-based training program.[58] This is discussed in more detail later in this report.

The term "drama master teacher" may have influenced some teachers' attitudes towards the project and the drama educators. Simone felt that the term "master teacher" caused some tension for the early childhood teachers and she noticed that they were more relaxed after they had a laugh about the label during an after school meeting. She felt after this a stronger rapport was formed. While acknowledging that the drama teachers who work alongside the classroom teachers have specialist knowledge of drama, Simone felt that the term "master teacher" was an alienating label for someone from Griffith University who was not currently teaching in the classroom or even working in a school. She was concerned that the teachers are being challenged enough through the drama inservice without having to think about a label that they do not feel comfortable with. She suggested that the term "drama specialist" would be more accurate and would cause fewer problems for the teachers.[59]

The Training Strategies used by the Drama Master Teachers

John O'Toole drew up the initial proposal for the grant application at short notice, and so the drama master teachers had no input at this stage.[60] Both drama master teachers were comfortable with the overall structure and followed it except for a few minor adaptations detailed below. Ross was keen for the teachers to have some guidelines and ideas about drama structures and strategies. Therefore he negotiated with John and the project administrator, Jessica, that the Flying Drama School handbook to be given to each participating teacher.[61]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Simone added two extra introductory sessions for each of her teachers that enabled her to get to know the children and familiarize them with drama conventions and structures through games and short role-plays.[62] The early childhood teachers discussed the benefits of these sessions. Simone also developed a different drama structure for the preschool students with the same theme of the sea as for her other teachers. Ross worked individually with the teachers after the first lesson, taking his drama in slightly different directions with each of his teachers.

Simone and Ross met together before they started to work with the teachers to establish that they were thinking about the project in a similar way.[63] They both provided extra resource sheets for the teachers. Ross provided an overview of the drama and Simone provided the drama sequence with notes about drama education as well as extra support materials about the theme, the sea.[64]

The drama educators used slightly different approaches in planning with the teachers.

1. Simone started by listening to the early childhood teachers' desired outcomes, and then designed a drama using Jeannie Baker's book, *The Hidden Forest* (Baker, 2000) as a pre-text. She spent the first two lessons familiarising the children with the rituals and structures of drama, before moving into the drama itself, and developed a slightly different drama for the preschool group. The early childhood teachers said they found this approach really helpful.

2. Ross listened to the curriculum aims of upper school teachers, then decided to use an adaptation of Cecily O'Neill's *Frank Miller Drama* (O'Neill, 1995) as an integrating drama framework. All these teachers said this structure achieved their desired aims.

It was clear from their post-course interviews that the two drama educators had similar approaches, and they stressed similar points that included[65]:

- Drama as a learning medium is different from performance/theatre;
- Drama as a learning medium is a teaching tool rather than an "add-on" subject;
- Drama can be a motivator for literacy activities and an integrator of all the KLAs;
- Most teachers already use drama strategies but do not label them as such;
- Teachers do not have to be able to "act" to teach drama;
- The nuts and bolts of drama, the strategies, structures and conventions can be easily mastered;
- "Teacher-in-role", "mantle of the expert" are important drama strategies;
- It is important for the students to work "in role" and develop a space where they have the freedom to develop their authentic voices;
- The importance of drama conventions and rituals (Simone particularly);
- The need to work smarter not harder (Ross particularly).

What follows is a brief summary of the approaches and perspectives of each drama master teacher. For detailed summaries of the two different drama workshop structures from each of the master drama teachers, see Appendix Five.

Ross Prior

During the first planning meeting, Ross asked the teachers about their interests and what they want the drama to cover. They agreed on "the media", and Ross took their ideas and created the drama structure. He chose Cecily O'Neill's *Frank Miller* as all the teachers thought his other suggestion, Philip Taylor's the *True Story of the Three Pigs*, did not hold so much relevance to their students.[66] Ross later commented that the teachers seemed to understand the *True Story of the Three Pigs* at the metaphoric level as they become more familiar with the drama process. It was interesting, however, that the teacher who had tried this drama by the time of the post-course interview found it very challenging. For each class the drama took slightly different directions depending on the interests of the students.[67]

Ross was impressed with how quickly the teachers had taken on the drama process, and felt they were very professional in their approach.[68] He thought that the teachers involved were comfortable with drama but may have been worried about how their peers saw them.[69] Ross noted how the teachers warmed to the drama process, developing a thorough understanding of drama as a learning medium rather than the "theatre" model that some of the teachers were more familiar with. He was particularly pleased with how one teacher, who was new to drama, took on and enjoyed teacher-in-role, and how two others were both aware of their dominant voices in the classroom and were prepared to work on this. He hoped the teacher most familiar with drama as a learning medium would contribute and extend her skills in an even more integrated way.[70]

To help overcome his presence in the classroom, Ross encouraged the students to see him as an ally, an interested observer who was supporting both them and the teachers.[71]

Simone Waller

Simone took a similar approach to Ross, promoting that drama as a learning medium is not a play but "moments in time" and a teaching strategy that can be incorporated all of the time as part of the classroom routine, rather than an extra.[72] She spent a lot of time working out what the teachers wanted to cover, and tried to put herself into the teachers'

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

shoes and empathise with the other pressures they have on them.[73] She rang the teachers when she had worked out a drama structure and sought their feedback to allow the "teachers to feel they are the experts and can guide the process of building a drama".[74] She wanted to give them the nuts and bolts first [75] as well as an awareness of the artistry and magic of drama.[76]

The early childhood teachers found Simone's unit very successfully guided the curriculum they wanted to cover. She developed a different unit that was more "play" based for the preschool class.[77] As mentioned previously, she felt the two initial extra sessions were important because the teachers and students needed to know how drama operated. She wanted to show them what were the expectations of behaviour and the important skills when in a drama, as well as the conventions that allow the drama teacher to guide the drama. She demonstrated use of command "freeze", stressed the need for listening, watching and observing and sharing ideas. She discussed the importance of imagining and pretending in a fun way, and showed them how a "video" controller can switch a drama on and off and manipulate the time frame with the fast forward/backward button. Finally it gave these very young children a chance to practice these rituals, conventions and presentation techniques before they began the drama unit proper.[78]

Simone was very aware of the nervousness of her teachers, particularly in using the strategies of stopping and starting within teacher-in-role. She was relieved when one of her teachers, after one unsuccessful try at teacher-in-role, reported that on her second try, on her own with her students, she had enjoyed it and had started to play with her children.[79] Simone also noted, as Ross did, that her teachers warmed to the drama process as it unfolded, and she could see them gain confidence and skills.[80]

Simone thought that all the early childhood teachers finished the training course with a good understanding of the processes of this form of drama, particularly how it is framed in the classroom with conventions and structures. She was also pleased with how they had understood the timing and framing of drama worlds, so they can jump around in time and place. [81]

Teachers' Understandings and Perceptions of Drama as a Innovative Way into Literacy

All teachers demonstrated they had understood the principles of drama as a learning medium and could clearly articulate how it was different from dramatic performance. John O'Toole, after listening to the teachers' reflections, successes and challenges of learning about and implementing drama education, commented that the teachers had already started to grapple with some of the finer points of teaching drama.[82]

The teachers understood that the quality of the literacy, whether it was oral or written, depended on the authentic engagement of the children within the drama worlds. Ross noted that they were particularly interested in discussing strategies that supported an environment for students' authentic voices to emerge through the teachers relinquishing their traditional role of being the dominant voice in the classroom.[83]

Taking on teacher-in-role was more of an issue with the less experienced drama teachers, but most the teachers wanted to discuss this aspect in more depth and unpack what had gone wrong and how it might be tackled better next time.

There was some concern among the upper primary teachers that some of the improvisations, particularly the "hidden voices" strategy might have gained more meaningful student responses if there had been more time to gain familiarity with the technique.[84] Ross stressed that the students needed to be challenged and that with practice they would master the technique. He constantly stressed the importance of students starting to understand that they have "permission" to speak through these activities.[85] The year 5 teacher was concerned about how effective this strategy was for his students, as he thought that it was too hard for most of them to grasp.[86] On the other hand, the year 6 teacher found that her students, despite struggling with the "hidden voices improvisation", built the tensions and emotions they had experienced into their writing showing a depth of feeling and involvement.[87]

There are no formulas about the choice of strategies and structures in a drama and when creating a new drama unit or even adapting a "tried and true' unit can run into problems. The creation and implementation of a drama unit depends on the teacher's experience and knowledge combined with her understandings of the interests and learning styles of her students. Simone pointed out that even the best laid plans for classroom dramas when implemented can still be a disaster, it is part of doing classroom drama. She commented, "Any teaching strategy can be like that - sometimes absolute gold, sometimes not. So many variables come into play."[88] Finding a balance between giving the students the space to improvise yet providing enough scaffolding so that they can achieve some authentic dialogue and intense engagement with the drama context is one of the pedagogical challenges of drama education. Most of the teachers certainly discussed this extensively in their reflection. This intense engagement is recognised as an essential prerequisite for an aesthetic encounter to occur (Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson, 1990, p. 18). While many other factors contribute to strong aesthetic encounter, these teachers were beginning to grasp how drama operates as an artistic learning medium, through constant critical reflection of their practice.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers Talking about Learning to Teach Drama

(a) As an Innovative Approach to Literacy

The teachers were unanimous that drama offered innovative ways into literacy, both oral and written. They reflected that as the shared fictional world unfolded gently, it built up emotional connections that supported the students to achieve a depth in their literacy tasks that would not be achieved normally.[89] The literacy outcomes achieved and the opportunities for literacy outcomes varied between the teachers. Integrating literacy outcomes in the drama was easier for the more experienced drama educators.[90]

The teachers' reflections, both in reflective conversations and in their journals, gave some insights into the richness of the literacy opportunities that the dramatic worlds provided:

Jenine – Yr 6 Camp Hill SS

Jenine saw enormous potential of drama, but was still nervous about starting from scratch and was keen to have ready-made units.[91] She was excited by the potential of drama as a learning medium, particularly how it changed her students views about their ability to act.[92] She noted too "we've acted out things, some little plays, not to where we try to get the children to react emotionally to situations and role-play a drama situation. That was very valuable having him do that and to watch kids responses."[93]

> "We sat in a close group and discussed what we had done over the preceding 4 sessions. I had explained that they were going to do a writing activity form the perspective of one of the characters. They were free to choose. I said that I wanted it to sound just as if Frank had written it or the mother or the son whom we had named Darren. We discussed how we might make it sound realistic. The students came up with these ideas:
>
> Darren: diary entries, or a letter to friend or to a grandparent.
>
> Frank: a letter to a mate from his time in prison.
>
> Mother: a letter to her own mother or to a close confidante.
>
> We quickly revisited the feelings, hopes and complex issues involved and they set to work. I was totally amazed by their efforts. They showed such depth of feeling and involvement - the best writing they had done all year. The whole project has been very worthwhile and a great learning experience for all."[94]

Talking about the tableaux drama strategy:

> "The students really enjoyed this group activity as they are used to working cooperatively. It also gave each of them more opportunity to express ideas in a less threatening structure. They developed some interesting scenes and one member of each group was required to verbalise a caption which expressed the message of each tableau."[95]

Literacy task:

> Each student took on the identity of a citizen, explained who they were and their connection and their apprehension. Prior to this, the children had been introduced to Letters to the Editor - the purpose, language and format. The students wrote a letter to the editor explaining their attitude to Frank Miller's return. These were edited and typed.[96]

Jim – Yr 5 Whites Hill SS

Jim has been involved in drama, mainly theatre, for many years, and saw it also as personal development. He liked how drama was a "disguised starting point" for literacy activities, and felt that the curriculum was not so formal and rigid when approached in this way.[97] He often used movies and TV shows to help his students understand narrative and story structures, and could see that drama was a similar starting point for looking at real life problems.[98]

He, like Robyn, was concerned about the accountability aspects of drama, as he said that other teachers and school administrators need to be convinced of the explicit curriculum value of drama, by providing several finished pieces of work.[99] He was also keen to explore drama for its own sake, without having to stop the students to write, and had hoped that his class would have enjoyed it for the fun of the drama. However he felt his class did not embrace drama in the way he had hoped.[100]

> "When I looked back in my books to see what we'd done, and we had done a couple of nice pieces, there was a nice letter ... The potential switched me on - thinking when the other teachers came out with ideas I had not considered, that was good, I thought 'Oh yeah, why not', and I really kicked myself for missing that because of my drama-based focus. It really is a minefield for writing subjects."[101]

> "The formal letter ... they thought they were doing a little bit of writing for the drama but they wrote a formal letter... The media approach means if you are going to be part of the media and write, then you have a newspaper report. If you are a person who has decided to write a short story for a magazine about the Frank Miller affair, you have a little narrative. If at the end of it you suddenly unveiled that it was a fairy tale and none of it was true - how could we have ended this fairy tale? You've got fantasy and changing endings, you could take that anywhere, there is no limit what you could do with that story and others like it."[102]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Drama has given you already the starting point - a disguised starting point. Often when I start my genre activities, and we start from a book and we look at something dry. So really it seem like 'Oh Mr Vickers wants us to do a bit of writing from a book.' ... There is a lot more creativity; the book of learning genres is quite structured. With the drama you can get away with less formal structure" [103]

Kaylene – Yr 1 Belmont SS

Kaylene liked the use of the imagination, and the simple strategies for taking on role that Simone demonstrated. She noted how reality was not far away and that the drama was constantly grounded in real life activities such as water safety rules, information about things poisoning the sea, and research that the students needed to do to move the drama along.[104] Kaylene had been using drama for several years, but had believed other teachers had thought her a bit silly. She now realised that this approach clearly demonstrates how literacy and other outcomes could be achieved through drama, and she felt more confident in using drama now.[105]

"... the amazing amount of literacy activities that eventuated after each drama session. Through drama every activity had meaning and purpose, there was no literacy taught in isolation during the four-week period. The students created posters, labels, signs and banners. They wrote letters and finally created a pamphlet. Further to this they eagerly developed a class oath which they chanted with such unity and belief."[106]

"In class, we discussed water safety and looked at other work we had done on this topic. We discussed possible topics for a water safety poster and the children drew and wrote slogans on their posters."[107]

"We had classroom discussion about *Keep the Water Clean*. Brainstormed all of their knowledge about water and pollution on white board. They got into groups to produce a large poster to show their knowledge."[108]

"Some of the letters were good. They were getting their points across. I was pleased with the quality of writing."[109]

Cathy C. – Yr 2 Belmont SS

Cathy had little experience with drama as a learning medium but quickly saw its enormous potential in the classroom and how it differed from performance drama. She was interested in the way her students spoke to her about Mrs Periwinkle (who was Cathy in role) as if she was a real person.[110] Cathy struggled with teacher-in-role for one session (when she was being watched in the Belmont LDC), but the next day she tried again, and said "I just decided I had to go all in, and did it without being self-conscious. It's like a game really, [which is how] I looked on it the second time. You just have to treat it like a game, Year 2's respond really well, they'll play."[111]

"I think the way Simone had the story book to read to them and then she had 'make a list of things to bring' and 'the journal'... That was a bit of a revelation to me. Your kids made up slogans, for their banners, mine had information things, and that's all literacy."[112]

In discussion on a boy's piece of writing, Cathy reads the boy's work first:

" 'We met a girl called Sophie and Mrs Periwinkle, and then Sophie went to get Mrs Periwinkle. We played games'... He doesn't say Mrs Periwinkle was Mrs Costello, he's saying it as if they were real people ... He's made that shift, he's writing in role."[113]

Robyn – Yr 7 Mt Gravatt SS

Robyn had trained in speech and drama many years ago, but it was not until she did a drama inservice several years ago with the release of the Drama Curriculum Guide, Drama Makes Meaning, was she able to see how it could be used as an integrating device in the classroom.[114]

She likes working from a central theme and drama creates this focus, but really likes having a unit written by an "expert" to begin with: "For me, I guess I'm not a terribly creative person, so I like something that's all written down, that tells you where to go and what to do next, and this episode I found wonderful because I'd always been using Paradise Island, year after year with different age groups and a different focus each time. I like to have something that works so you don't have to go floundering around. That's that part I liked about it." [115]

"Activities that followed on were a letter to the editor from Frank Miller himself, so we used persuasive text. So we were able to use the language I wanted them to have experience with. We also did a procedural text, a petition from the townspeople... We did an editorial, where we looked at newspaper editorials... [I asked them:] you are the editor you have to make a comment on this person coming back into town. It's your role as an editor; you have the responsibility of making some sort of a social comment. We did some debating on 'Children should be suspended from the school for bullying'. That's an underlying thing that is happening in my classroom that also came out because Frank Miller was a bully when he was young. It fitted in nicely. For critical literacy, photographic journalism we were looking at how media portrayed Frank Miller, and to do that I asked them to bring along pictures of well known people that had been photographed in unfortunate situations, and of course they went to those News Weeklies where you see those fabulous looking people without make up, with food stuck this way. So

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that was really good to look at, and so I asked, 'How do you think they would have portrayed Frank Miller? Would they have had him smiling with some kids around?' That was a good discussion."[116]

Cathy H. – Preschool Carina SS

Cathy liked the rituals and structures that cue in the children to the drama process. She said it helped them think about the drama, so they knew what was coming.[117] Cathy articulated some deep understandings of how drama works for early childhood children. She discussed how drama is a "logical and natural way to do literacy", appreciating that drama as a learning medium requires a different focus than performance work. Cathy also talked about how drama changes the power dynamics of a classroom and that can be threatening to many teachers when they take a risk and relinquish control.[118]

"In terms of literacy, it's all there. Drama is really the only area where you can use all of the KLAs quite naturally and it's developing that social context and it's developing life like learning situations, there in the *ELA guidelines*, establishing social contexts for literacy … but the children are establishing it with you - they have ownership, and therefore the means to be able to follow it. Therefore there is a huge potential to tap into there - something I look forward to using more, but I can see that there is a process there for myself to develop skills and need to develop confidence."[119]

"Then we had the town meeting, we came back from the underwater and I spoke with the children, and it was then 'these sea creatures have told me…' and 'the crown of thorns said …'"[120]

"If we had time to follow up we were going onto doing signs like 'No Litter'. One child had come up the idea that you draw a person dropping rubbish and draw a line through it - visual literacy - so that's what we were working on, we were going to put signs up, as well that also signs that said 'Don't Drop Oil' and working out the best place to put it. They suggested the boat shed because that is where everyone gets in their boat so would be the best location to put it than on the beach."[121]

"With children a little bit older they could go onto the literacy projects where they are working on a lot more extension from the drama process moving into other literacy areas. With the younger children the drama was really the main thing for them."[122]

Simon – Yr 6/7 extension class Carina SS

Simon thought his students had a powerful experience during the Frank Miller drama[123] and wanted to continue at this level with future classes, and he is also a strong advocate for drama. His approach to drama demonstrated that he was very interested in how to support students to develop their own "voices" and was able to easily take on a less dominant role with his class and particularly enjoyed the teacher-in-role work.[124]

"I think it improved their literacy in that particular situation. There was more depth of feeling, more involved with the writing than if they had just been asked to write a piece. They were more involved. The quality was good there. The potential too, it's like a launching pad in new genres that you might not normally attack."[125]

(b) Achieving other Key Learning Area outcomes

The teachers used the drama for achieving outcomes in other Key Learning Areas, and they all were keen to develop this integration further. Robyn was most experienced at this as she had been using drama as an integrator for several years. She achieved outcomes in Maths, arts, multi-literacy (Information Technology) and Health and Physical Education.[126] Jenine also saw the enormous potential in this area.[127] Kaylene also used the drama experience as a total integrator for her curriculum, and commented that the drama that Simone gave them flowed seamlessly into all the other outcomes she had wanted to achieve during the term.[128]

(c) Achieving other outcomes

The teachers identified several other outcomes that their students demonstrated, including:

- Exploring other points of view [129]
- Realisation that they could act [130]
- Cooperative group work [131]
- Drama gives you more than just writing better stories [132]
- Self confidence, more than literacy, movement, own sense of bodies, their voices, their confidence, non-verbal communication, using prior knowledge, problem solving, cooperating with others, having fun by learning not to butt in [133]
- For the early childhood children the process of "being" in the drama, and following the cues and rituals of the drama and taking on role [134]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Involvement of children who would not normally sit back, particularly students from different ethnic backgrounds [135]
- Girls taking on roles of males [136]

Key Teacher Role

All the teachers felt reasonably confident about working in their own school with interested teachers, though they were not so sure about working across the cluster, they all thought it was a good idea. They felt that even working with teachers in their own school that they needed more experience (with the exception of Robyn), and opted for a collaborative "non-expert" approach with other teachers.

There were mainly two reasons for their hesitation to work with teachers from other schools:

- They were not confident in drama, and several were concerned that other teachers might be more experienced than they were.
- They thought the logistics difficult, specifically finding time to plan and work with the teachers from other schools.

Jenine summarised what most of the teachers who were new to drama were feeling about the key teacher role:

> "I think it's different working in your own school because you feel more confident with the people - people know you and can accept your muddle-headedness. I don't know whether I'd be proficient enough at it to help people. I'm sure if you went to another school and someone else was more experienced at it, and you are trying to explain what you are trying to do, there might be people there who could run rings around you ... I need 12 months of doing it, trying things out. Read a bit more."[137]

Moving into Tier Two

All the teachers were keen to start the year with a new drama in 2002, as they were really interested to see how long-term drama experiences affected their students' literacy outcomes.[138]

Jenine expressed this by saying:

> "I'd like to see how they write by the end of the year if they did more drama. I really loved the English part of the program, that's my area - I like to see them writing well, spelling well, writing good sentences, getting some feeling into what they write."[139]

With one exception, no other teachers had tackled a new drama unit at the time of the post-course evaluation interviews, but two teachers were intending to try Philip Taylor's the *True Story of the Three Little Pigs* drama before the end of term. The teacher that had tried this drama had struggled with it, particularly in grasping the overall structure of the drama, and thought that starting with a simpler drama structure would have been more helpful. He commented "I felt I was trying to be creative but I did not really have enough things to draw on to really resurrect something if it's starting to die. I think it will come with experience."[140]

Belmont SS is a New Basics school so the teachers here said that they would like to integrate drama into the Rich Tasks, particularly as a way of introducing units[141]. One of the Belmont teachers will be moving to the upper school in 2002.[142]

Two teachers involved in the development of their school's literacy plan were keen to see drama included in these plans.[143] One of these teachers had given a short presentation to his staff during which much interest was shown[144], and another was intending to run the introduction to the Frank Miller drama during the Pupil Free Day in 2002 as a way to find teachers interested in drama.[145]

The teachers who spoke about how they would approach drama next year agreed they would start from the interests of their students and negotiate with them.[146]

The teachers were given past Queensland Association for Drama in Education (QADIE) and Drama Australia (DA) journals, and two thought they would read them over the holidays. They were also given a membership form for QADIE, and most were keen for their school to join. Sue Butler will organise that the LDC joins QADIE, and will also purchase some drama education support reference. She also has a set of past QADIE and DA journals for the LDC library.

A video has been made of the complete set of the drama classroom-based training sequences, which includes an early childhood class and an upper primary class. This video illustrates the modelling, support and guidance of each of the master teachers. Each teacher involved in the project will receive a copy to aid them in Phase 2 of the project as they support other teachers in using drama as an innovative approach to literacy.

The support of Sue Butler at the LDC has been integral to the teachers moving into the next tier of the program. Most of the teachers have, on several occasions, shared their emerging drama practice with others through literacy cluster meetings and conferences. In addition, two of the teachers, both of whom had used drama in their classroom prior to this drama in-service, are ready to train other teachers using the model adopted in tier one. Both these teachers have also been tackling drama units with their classes.

Achievements of teachers to date (to May 2002)

(Thanks to Sue Butler for this summary. For expanded list see Appendix Eight)

Individual level

- Teachers are using drama pedagogies learned from the Master teachers (Term 4, 2001) with a new group of children. It was felt that teachers new to the pedagogy needed this time for consolidation
- Teachers are supporting each other and being supported by the critical friend through email and a term meeting

School level

- Two teachers have shared strategies with their own staff in their own schools
- One school – New Basics trial – is making links with drama and philosophy in Rich task planning for Term 2
- Honours student from Griffith is investigating how Drama pedagogy can improve children's oracy (being observed by the class teacher)

Organisational level

- Five of the trained teachers presented their experiences at the LDC Conference *Teachers talking to Teachers* on February 23rd to a mixed audience of teachers across several teachers as well as some pre-service teachers.
- LDC Coordinator plus one of the trained teachers demonstrated the strategies to a group of visiting Victorian principals on 14th March – documented by photographs sent on to Victoria
- LDC Coordinator explained the links with Productive Pedagogies and Drama, the potential of drama as a teaching strategy and the coaching-mentoring model on the CD Rom accompanying Whole School Literacy Planning Guidelines document currently being delivered to all schools in Queensland.
- Powerpoint presentation has been prepared to share with teachers in the GAP cluster on April pupil free day (two workshop sessions)
- Network of teachers meets in April to plan a workshop for interested teachers in the district. Eventually (funding permitting) key teachers will be released to coach/mentor further teachers in individual classrooms.
- Arts Syllabus drama education officer has linked with this network and will attend our May network meeting to provide support and links with Drama modules in the new syllabus. This is aimed to empower our 'key' teachers further in their mentoring roles in Term 2.
- Proposal to use our key teachers in a Unit of work linking the Arts syllabus with Literacy outcomes (Literate Futures)
- The LDC Cluster have joined QADIE and will therefore have access to journals, units of work and the primary focus day In-service on 27th April.

Discussion of Emergent Issues

(a) Teachers Learning to Use Drama as Learning Medium

The most effective drama units are developed or adapted by teachers to meet their curriculum needs as well as engage the interest of their students. In addition, using drama as a learning medium demands that teachers work pedagogically in ways that are in opposition to dominant teaching approaches (Balaisis, 2002). For many teachers this requires a massive realignment of their thinking and teaching approaches. One central issue that the teachers identified was the need to find ways to move away from being the dominant voice, and create dramatic worlds where students can find their authentic voices.[147] Essentially they identified that to implement drama well, teachers must undertake a significant paradigm shift away from traditional and dominant styles of teaching. This was clearly evident in this study as the teachers struggled with

- being creative with the drama strategies and structures to design drama units that engaged their students, met their curriculum needs and were achievable with their limited drama experience;
- allowing the students to take on more power in appropriate ways;
- finding questioning techniques so that students were using their authentic voices;
- finding ways to allow their students to problem-pose as well as problem-solve.

In drama, new understandings and knowledge can be presented as a "toolbox" or a kit of drama strategies and structures. The drama educators either demonstrated or discussed these new skills and understandings with the teachers before they were asked to implement them with their classes. The teachers found them simple enough to grasp in principal and could attempt their implementation, in most cases, quite successfully first time and certainly during the second attempt. Most of the teachers found the new strategies challenging, and all the teachers expressed the need for more practice, familiarity and experience in using the strategies, and said they need to gain the personal resources to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

draw on effective pedagogical solutions when things don't go to plan. During the evaluator's observations of the lessons taught by the different participating teachers, there was evidence that each teacher started to successfully adapt the strategies to suit their teaching style. Several of the teachers, even the most experienced, did not think they had the knowledge and experience to write their own drama units and were keen to use "tried and true" examples of drama units.[148] The early childhood teachers felt most confident about building drama into their teaching units next year rather than follow a pre-written unit.[149]

(b) The Model of Teacher Professional Development

Many researchers agree that to support teachers to move away from dominant and traditional pedagogy, professional development providers need to find new and improved approaches that move away from the "delivery" model of training and accommodates recent research and theory about teacher thinking and reflective practice (Dadds, 2001, p. 50; King & Newmann, 2000, p. 576). They stress the need for teachers' voices be heard in the planning of professional development as well as approaches that consider individual learning styles and sensitivities and challenges their practices and beliefs so that long-term change is more likely to occur (Stein, Smith, & Silver, 1999). Teachers also need opportunities for new knowledge production, mentoring, experimentation and feedback and collaboration with professional peers and academics (King & Newmann, 2000, p. 576-577).

The professional development approach in this project met most of these criteria. Once the teachers had chosen to be involved in this project, the drama master teachers actively sought the teachers' voices in planning for the drama structures.[150] Thus the teachers' new skills and understandings were embedded in and relevant to the teachers' classroom contexts and designed to meet their curriculum needs. The feedback from the teachers indicated that they were, in the main, very happy with how the professional development process met their needs. Some of these comments are cited in previous sections of this report.

It was certainly not a "delivery" model of professional development and the gentle hand-over of the drama leader's role from the drama master teacher to the teachers meant that the teachers could experience and find personal meaning as they tried out their new pedagogical skills and understandings. This hand over process was supported through mentoring and reflection based on their situated classroom practice.

Both drama master teachers, Ross and Simone, were concerned that the teachers had not experienced an extended drama role-play at an adult level. Participation in a drama does not give the same experience as teaching a drama unit, and teachers need to experience both ways of knowing drama (Balaisis, 2002). Until the teachers have a vicarious experience it is difficult to imagine the feelings of being "inside" a drama. This is an effective way to extend and deepen the teachers' understandings of the effects of drama and its potential as the learning medium. Thus the master drama teachers thought that an extended adult drama needed to be built into this professional development model as it was in the successful Three Day Drama In-service that ran at the Queensland Performing Arts Complex for several years (Jeffs, 1992, p. 35-42). This was also one of the recommendations in the Brisbane South Drama In-service Evaluation (Drama Advisory Committee, 1980, p. 17).

(c) Teachers Moving from Tier One to Tier Two, Long Term Empowerment

The drama master teachers both noted that the initial impulse of the project through collaborative planning, modelling and training quickly established the desire, motivation and enough skills for the teachers to start using drama as a pedagogical tool.[151] Long term empowerment of individuals possibly takes years, and is most likely to succeed as individuals move through an interconnected process of mentoring, collaboration, training, experimentation, sharing and consolidation through practice (Kieffer, 1984). Thus the long-term change in the teachers' pedagogical practice is difficult to evaluate. What may be built into the initial in-service however, are the building blocks most likely to empower the teachers to become self-directed learners so that they feel confident as they move into Tier Two. Just what these building blocks are and how this longer-term empowerment might be achieved within the constraints and realities of the primary classroom is still being debated and discussed in current research literature on teacher professional development. However, in this project the teachers were quite clear about what they thought would support them into developing and experimenting with their own drama units, so they could become drama resource teachers.

As the teachers moved into planning their own drama units at the end of tier one, most of them hit a wall. They found it difficult to come up with ideas for effective drama structures because of their limited experience as well a lack of confidence in their ability to be creative with the new strategies. In addition, they did not have access to resources to draw examples from. In fact, several teachers still had not developed or tried a new drama unit by the beginning of May 2002, although they still are keen to use drama. It seems the teachers needed more formalised support in their planning, as well as access to a range of drama teaching resources to broaden and deepen their understandings. Even though phone support was offered, none of the teachers took advantage of it. It may be that the level of support needed by the novice drama teachers during this critical transferral time is comparatively low, as demonstrated by one teacher who did receive planning support from a drama mentor.[152] This teacher only required one planning meeting, and a meeting during the initial phases of her drama unit to design an innovative and successful drama unit.

Lack of time seems to have been the major factor especially finding extra time to plan. Some of the teachers were keen to form a small drama network to specifically analyse drama units and adapt them to their classes although none found time to do so. While the drama master teachers were in their classroom, drama took top priority, but since then the teachers have had other priorities and distractions, both professional and personal. This reinforces the need for the Arts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Syllabus Implementation package and support resources to be in the hands of teachers as soon as possible, to remind teachers that drama is one of the Key Learning Areas and that drama outcomes will eventually be part of school reporting.

Recommendations

(a) Improving Tier One

(i) The Introductory Session

- Tighter structure, improved process of selection of participants and some information about involvement in Tier Two for non-selected teachers.
- Handouts – documentation of the drama experiences, introduction and project timeline, information about Tier Two.
- Include only one adult drama that leads into discussion about how drama can be used to achieve literacy outcomes.
- Possibly include a session where the teachers split into levels and work with each drama master teacher.

(ii) Reflective journal guidelines and discussion

- Support the teachers' reflective journal writing through guidelines and tips.

(iii) Approaching more difficult improvisation strategies

- The more difficult improvisation strategies need sufficient scaffolding especially for the younger students, so that all students can experience some level of achievement.

(iv) Drama immersion experience at adult level for the teachers

- The drama master teachers strongly suggest there be an opportunity for the teachers to attend a longer adult drama.

(v) Initial advertising of the project

- If possible a couple of weeks notice needs to be given about the first meeting and clearer explanation of the project in the advertising of the project

(vi) The drama learning process

- Both levels would have been improved by increasing the number of classroom-based workshops to 6 or 7.

(b) Teachers Moving into Tier Two

This study uncovered several ways to that teachers might be further supported as they develop their new drama teaching skills by the provision of:

(i) Additional planning time.

All the teachers during tier one were willing to have meetings after school so this arrangement could be continued. One teacher who requested support found one pre-unit planning session plus a brief meeting during the unit was enough to move her into her own drama unit.

(ii) Easily accessible planning support.

This would be most effective at school level. It could be achieved by linking the novice drama teachers with more experienced drama teachers such as their peers or outside drama master teachers.

(iii) A coordinator of (i) and (ii).

This study clearly demonstrated that this *coordination role in critical in ensuring the teachers apply and develop their new skills.*

(iv) Improved access to quality and appropriate drama resources.

Literacy and arts resource centres at school or cluster level might apply for funding to purchase good quality drama resources. The support materials for the new Arts Syllabus will be important resources for beginning and experienced drama teachers. Teachers and schools could be encouraged to join QADIE.

(v) An adult extended role-play experience as an additional component to the training model.

Drama education departments at local universities or QADIE could provide such workshops in the future.

Conclusion

The teachers were quick to realise the enormous potential of drama, not only as an innovative approach to literacy but as an effective curriculum integrator and a way of engaging students, particularly emotionally and meaningfully with the themes, characters, issues and content. They also noted, particularly during the follow up interviews [15], that drama pedagogy aligns well with latest curriculum advances in Queensland, such as Productive Pedagogies and Rich Tasks, and is a powerful means of allowing students to actively demonstrate learning outcomes.

The professional training model in drama education was clearly successful in meeting the goals of tier one, the training phase of the project. The teachers demonstrated that they were able to use drama strategies and structures with their classes. They were able to discuss and constructively reflect on the successes, challenges and problems that they encountered with their new and expanded pedagogical approach. They all acknowledged and demonstrated a range of literacy outcomes that resulted from using drama as a learning medium. In addition, all the teachers enjoyed the professional development approach, and apart from needing further planning support, they were keen to continue with this approach to literacy.

The major limitation of Tier One was the short amount of time allocated to it, only 6 weeks. In addition, to undertake a substantial change in their teaching approach, teachers need ongoing support, especially during the critical phase when they start to plan and implement their own drama units. Sue Butler supported and continues to support all the teachers to share their practice. The funding has also provided teacher release time for two of the teachers to they train others. Support for teachers planning their own units, however, has been less organised. The teachers who had some drama experience have moved into designing new drama units, however the teachers who were new to drama have needed further help to get started on their own units. The teachers' lack of confidence as they move into planning their own units is not surprising. It takes years of experience, experimentation, reflection, peer support and further professional development to become expert drama teachers. This is evident by the high membership of high school specialist drama teachers in QADIE, and their willingness to continually attend professional development workshops and conferences.

The evaluation in this report has been more extensive than in the Brisbane South Region Drama In-service Initiative report (Drama Advisory Committee, 1980), and has highlighted the complexity of the model by tracking its planning and implementation. Several important recommendations for improvements have emerged. It has overwhelmingly confirmed that the participating teachers see drama as an important way of achieving a range of high quality and improved literacy outcomes. It also confirmed the recommendation in the 1980 Brisbane South report that *ongoing professional and organisational support was a critical factor to maintain high quality drama teaching and enable long-term empowerment of teachers through this model of professional development.* In addition it indicated that with limited support following on from an intensive core-training program, some significant changes in teachers' practice can occur resulting in more innovative approaches to literacy that supports improved student outcomes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bibliography

Balaisis, J. (2002). The challenge of teaching "in role". *Applied Theatre Researcher, 3*.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Robinson, R. (1990). *The art of seeing: an interpretation of aesthetic encounter*. Los Angeles: The Getty Institute for the Arts.

Dadds, M. (2001). Continuing professional development: nurturing the expert within. In J. Soler & A. Craft & H. Burgess (Eds.), *Teacher development: exploring our practice* (pp. 50-56). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Drama Advisory Committee. (1980). *Classroom based in-service in the strategies of educational drama: evaluation of an in-service model*. Brisbane: Department of Speech and Drama, Mt Gravatt College of Advanced Education.

Kieffer, C. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. In J. Rappaport & C. Swift & R. Hess (Eds.), *Studies in empowerment: Steps towards understanding and action*. New York: The Haworth Press.

King, M. B., & Newmann, F. M. (2000). Will teacher learning advance school goals? *Phi Delta Kappa, 81*(9), 576-580.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 257-277.

Orton, J. (1994). Action research and reflective practice: an approach to research for drama educators. *NJ, 18*(2), 84-95.

Education Queensland (2000). *Literate futures: report of literacy review for Queensland State Schools*. Brisbane: Queensland Government.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *Reflective practitioner : how professionals think in action* (rev. ed.). Aldershot, England: Arena.

Stein, M. K., Smith, M. S., & Silver, E. A. (1999). The development of professional developers: learning to assist teachers in new settings in new ways. *Harvard Educational Review, 69*(3), 237-.

Taylor, P. (1996). Doing reflective practitioner research in arts education. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Researching drama and arts education: paradigms and possibilities* (pp. 25-58). London: Falmer Press.

Endnotes

[1] Ross post inter : 22
[2] See Appendix One
[3] See Appendix Three, Interview Questions
[4] I am a part-time teacher at Pullenvale Environmental Education Centre
[5] Pre-course survey results, see Appendix Four
[6] Jim 6/12/01 : 37 - 42
[7] Jenine 4/12/01 : 63 - 64
[8] post eval session : 147 - 151
[9] Simon - Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 52 – 53;
[10] Robyn 20/11/01 : 157 - 173
[11] Cathy - Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 72-77
[12] Kaylene - Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 91 - 91
[13] Pre-course survey results
[14] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 33
[15] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01: 54
[16] Pre-course survey results
[17] Jenine 4/12/01 : 95 – 109; Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 80 - 87; Jim 6/12/01 : 102 - 107; Robyn 20/11/01 : 37 – 42; Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 62 – 67 & 120 - 132
[18] Pre-course survey results
[19] Jim 6/12/01: 92-95
[20] Ross post inter : 31 – 31
[21] Kaylene Cathy 24/11/01: 55
[22] Kaylene Cathy 24/11/01: 56
[23] Ross post inter : 35, 39; Simone post interview: 159
[24] Simone post interview: 167
[25] Robyn 20/11/01: 33; Simon/Cathy 3/12/01: 57
[26] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01: 56
[27] Ross post inter: 36
[28] Pre-course survey results
[29] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01
[30] Jim 6/12/01 : 32; Robyn 20/11/01 : 152 - 156
[31] Kaylene - Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 141
[32] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 30 - 31
[33] Jenine 4/12/01 : 25 – 27
[34] Jim 6/12/01 : 35 - 36
[35] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 23 - 29
[36] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 23 - 29
[37] Robyn 20/11/01 : 17 - 18
[38] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 83 - 83
[39] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 89 - 90
[40] Planning meeting 29/9/01 : 71 – 72; Researchers field notes after the introductory session.
[41] Jim during the post eval session : 31 – 33
[42] Jim 6/12/01 : 47
[43] Jenine 4/12/01 : 71
[44] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 33
[45] Simone post interview : 10
[46] Simone post interview : 174 - 176
[47] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 88
[48] Jenine 4/12/01 : 68
[49] Simon - Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 27 – 90: references to the reflection time being essential to the process - Kaylene and Cathy, Jenine, Jim
[50] Simone post interview : 71-76
[51] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 136 - 140
[52] Cathy - Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 94 - 100
[53] Robyn 20/11/01 : 122 - 131
[54] Jim 6/12/01: 56
[55] Jenine 4/12/01 : 58
[56] Jim 6/12/01 : 48 - 50
[57] Interest in drama network – Simon, Jenine, Cathy
[58] Planning 1. 16/10/01 : 33 – 35; Simone post interview : 132
[59] Simone post interview : 109 - 120
[60] Planning meeting 29/9/01 : 70
[61] Ross post inter : 17 – 22
[62] Simone post interview : 8 ; Planning meeting 29/9/01 : 37 - 48
[63] Ross post inter : 21
[64] Ross post inter : 17 – 22, Simone post interview : 207 - 207
[65] Ross post inter : 24 - 27
[66] Planning 1. 16/10/01 : 23 - 27
[67] post eval session : 20 - 21
[68] post eval session : 22 - 24
[69] Ross post inter : 28 - 28
[70] Ross post inter : 64 - 103
[71] Ross post inter : 53 - 54
[72] Simone post interview : 53 – 53
[73] Simone post interview : 14 - 14
[74] Planning meeting 29/9/01 : 46
[75] Simone post interview : 204
[76] Simone post interview : 42
[77] Simone post interview : 202
[78] Simone post interview : 32 - 38
[79] Simone post interview : 61 - 61
[80] Simone post interview : 83 - 98
[81] Simone post interview : 178 - 180
[82] Evaluator's field notes after the Post-course group evaluation meeting.
[83] Ross post inter : 91 & 98
[84] Jim 6/12/01 : 16 - 16 ; Robyn: post eval session : 54 - 59 ;
[85] Researcher's field notes, EJ pp. 23 – 24; Jim 6/12/01 : 16
[86] Jim 6/12/01 : 150-157;
[87] Jenine reflections : 69. See also examples of students writing in Appendix Seven
[88] post eval session : 69
[89] Jenine 4/12/01 : 28 - 31 ; Robyn 20/11/01 : 79 - 90
[90] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 48 & 91-102; Kaylene/Cathy reflections ; 10 – 28; Robyn reflective jnl
[91] Jenine 4/12/01 : 113 - 115
[92] Jenine 4/12/01 : 28 - 31
[93] Jenine 4/12/01 : 31
[94] Jenine reflections : 64 - 69
[95] Jenine reflections : 16 - 16
[96] Jenine reflections : 26 - 29
[97] Jim 6/12/01 : 68 - 68
[98] Jim 6/12/01 : 80 - 86
[99] Jim 6/12/01 : 116 - 117
[100] Jim 6/12/01 : 132 - 133
[101] Jim 6/12/01 : 54 - 56

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[102] Jim 6/12/01 : 64
[103] Jim 6/12/01 : 68
[104] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 12 - 24
[105] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 91 - 91
[106] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 9 - 10
[107] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 39 - 41
[108] Kaylene Cathy reflections : 49 - 51
[109] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 157 - 157
[110] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 42 - 44
[111] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 39
[112] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 72 - 78
[113] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 124 - 130
[114] Robyn 20/11/01 : 19 - 20
[115] post eval session : 87 - 87
[116] post eval session : 109 - 109
[117] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 88 - 88
[118] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 141 - 155
[119] post eval session : 143 - 145
[120] post eval session : 166 - 168
[121] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 136 - 137
[122] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 106 - 106
[123] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 38
[124] Ross post inter : 97 - 99
[125] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 72 - 74
[126] Robyn 20/11/01 : 225 - 225
[127] Jenine reflections : 31 - 31
[128] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 141
[129] Jenine 4/12/01 : 16 - 16
[130] Jenine 4/12/01 : 31 - 31
[131] Jenine reflections : 5 - 20
[132] Jim 6/12/01 : 113 - 113
[133] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 97 - 113
[134] post eval session : 126 - 134
[135] Robyn: post eval session : 166 - 173
[136] Robyn 20/11/01 : 107 - 109
[137] Jenine 4/12/01 : 95 - 109
[138] Jim 6/12/01 : 144 – 145, Jenine 4/12/01 : 29 & 55
[139] Jenine 4/12/01 : 129 - 139
[140] Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 44 - 48
[141] Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 145 - 148
[142] casual conversation with researcher
[143] Robyn 20/11/01 : 135 - 138
[144] Simon: Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 21 - 25
[145] Robyn 20/11/01 : 141 - 141
[146] Cathy and Simon: Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 164 – 164
[147] Jenine reflections : 40 - 41 ; Jim - post eval session : 48 – 51, Cathy H. - post eval session : 137
[148] Simon - Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 : 48; Jenine 4/12/01 : 31, Robyn - post eval session : 87
[149] Kaylene - Kaylene/Cathy 24/11 : 165; Cathy H. - Simon/Cathy 3/12/01 ; 139
[150] Ross post inter : 57; Simone post interview : 18
[151] Ross post inter, Simone post interview
[152] Jenine Nesbit-Smith planning interview and researcher's field notes
[152] Robyn Grimshaw, researcher's field notes p. 44a, Simon Banks, researcher's field notes p. 45

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
Reproduction Release (Specific Document)

ERIC

CS 512 368

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: PRETENDING TO LITERACY : LEARNING LITERACY THROUGH DRAMA	
Author(s): JOHN O'TOOLE, ELLEN APPLEBY, SUE BUTLER	
Corporate Source: GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY CENTRE FOR APPLIED THEATRE RESEARCH	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually mac available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following thre options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTE SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ ✓	↑	↑
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting repro and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons o than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for n profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discr inquiries.

Signature: John O'Toole	Printed Name/Position/Title: PROF JOHN O'TOOLE
Organization/Address: APPLIED THEATRE RESEARCH GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY, NATHAN, QUEENSLAND, AUSTRALIA 4111	Telephone: [61-7] 38755720 Fax: [61-7] 38755605
	E-mail Address: j.otoole@griffith.edu.au Date: 13/08/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from anot source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@eric.ac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org